



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,737	12/20/2000	Tatsuhisa Nitta	P107254-00004	4987

23353 7590 03/13/2003

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/739,737

Applicant(s)

NITTA ET AL. 

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Application has been examined. The claims 1-10 are pending. The examination results are as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goddard (US patent 5,502,808).

Goddard et al. disclose in figure 1 that a display apparatus for displaying images based on signals received from a host (2) comprising a means for determining an interface type of the host, plurality of storage means (3, 8) each storing specification information relating to display for one of interface types to be connected; and output means for outputting from the storage means to the host, the specification information corresponding to the interface type determined by the determining means (see figure 1 and see abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2674

4. Claims 2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard et al (US patent 5,502,808) in view of the Title "Digital Visual Interface" cited by applicant).

Goddard et al. discloses a display apparatus in claim 1 above with the two storage means and one determining means is arranged the VGA (Video Graphic Adapter) interface (see figure 1). However, they do not disclose a storage means for DVI-I interface and DDC (Display Data Channel), and a DC current circuit. The "Digital Visual Interface" discloses in pages 25 and 43 that DVI interface and DDC (Display Data Channel), and a DC current circuit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of the Title "Digital Visual Interface" discloses in pages 25 and 43 in the system display of Goddard et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide allow a monitor with a digital interface to attach directly to either system connector.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard et al. (US patent 5,502,808) in view of Gradinariu (US patent 6,378,008).

Goddard et al. disclose in figure 1 that a display apparatus for displaying images based on signals received from a host (2) comprising a means for determining an interface type of the host, plurality of storage means (3, 8) each storing specification information relating to display for one of interface types to be connected; and output means for outputting from the storage means to the host, the specification information corresponding to the interface type determined by the determining means (see figure 1 and see abstract).

Art Unit: 2674

However, Goddard et al. do not disclose that the output means comprises a multiplexer.

Gradinariu discloses in figure 3 that the output comprises a multiplexer (495) which carries the data out off the memory circuit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Gradinariu in the system of Goddard et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the output the logic state of a selected memory cell.

6. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard et al. (US patent 5,502,808) in view of Bilich et al. (US patent 5,764,547 cited by Applicant).

Goddard et al. disclose in figure 1 that a display apparatus for displaying images based on signals received from a host (2) comprising a means for determining an interface type of the host, plurality of storage means (3, 8) each storing specification information relating to display for one of interface types to be connected; and output means for outputting from the storage means to the host, the specification information corresponding to the interface type determined by the determining means (see figure 1 and see abstract).

However, they do not disclose that the specification information is EDID. Bilich et al. disclose that the host system can request EDID information (see column 1, lines 49-50 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of the Bilich et al. in the system display of Goddard et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide allow a monitor with a digital interface to attach directly to either system connector.

Art Unit: 2674

Response To Arguments

7. Applicant argument filed on 1-2-03 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Goddard fails to teach output means for outputting from the storage means to the host. However, this argument is not persuasive due to the teaching of Goddard as disclosed above. Therefore, this rejection is maintained.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on (703) 305-4709.

Art Unit: 2674

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231


Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen
March 8, 2003



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600